

53

DEBATE ON ADOPTION

OF THE

REPORT OF NAVAL COMMITTEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 27, 1876.

Mr. DANFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the little time allotted me for the discussion of the report now before the House it will be impossible to more than barely allude to a few of the questions involved in the investigation upon which this report is founded.

I quote from the speech of the gentleman from Alabama :

The present Secretary of the Navy, being fortified with seven years of experience in his office, with a patronage of \$2,000,000 annually, with thousands of followers, many of whom were dependent upon his will or caprice for their bread, determined to resist such an investigation as would lay bare the abuses, errors, violations of law and frauds which are given to the public in the majority report which is now pending before the House.

I was astonished that such a declaration should fall from the lips of any member of this committee, when I remember that out of more than four thousand printed pages of testimony taken by the committee fully one thousand of these pages were furnished by the Secretary of the Navy and officers of his Department in order that the committee might be aided in pursuit of *the object they had in view*. More than one thousand closely-printed pages of this matter required four months of preparation in the office of the Secretary and in his various Bureaus, and have been furnished to the committee, and are now published as part of the testimony.

Mr. Speaker, when I remember that when this committee went armed with a commission from this body to every navy yard upon the Atlantic coast, armed with a warrant to investigate, the committee were received, from Norfolk to Kittery, the navy yard gates were thrown open and the committee were received with salutes that indicated the dignity and importance of the investigation; and when I remember that from the commandant of the yards to all the employees witnesses were subpoenaed and were freely offered and freely testified; when I recollect that every discharged employee around the navy yards was free to come before the committee and tell his story, whatever it might be; and when I remember that here in the rooms of the committee the doors were open to any one who might offer himself or herself as a witness to testify to any wrong or imagined abuse existing in the Department; and when I remember that during the four months of this investigation the doors were closed, absolutely closed, in the face of the Secretary and his Bureau officers and every person intended to be affected injuriously by this investigation, I repeat that it does seem to me strange indeed that such a declaration should be made by the gentleman from Alabama. What witness refused to appear? What witness failed to respond to the subpoena of the committee?

I have been unable to discover in the conduct either of the Secretary of the Navy or any of his Bureau officers any disposition to shirk the fullest and fairest investigation of the conduct of the affairs of the Navy Department in the last seven years of its administration.

I need not say to the House that the members of the committee did not shirk the responsibility imposed upon them by the resolutions under which they were acting. They did not fail to respond to the request of any person, so far as I am informed, who desired to come as a witness before the committee. In reading the testimony taken by the committee, we find that inquiry was made of various witnesses as to whether they knew of any fraud, any error, or any abuse existing in the Department, or any of the Bureaus of the Department. If a negative response was elicited, then almost universally that question was followed up with the further question, "Do you know of any person who can give us any information in relation to any frauds, abuses or errors existing in the administration of the Navy Department?" And so witnesses were followed up, and wherever there was the slightest hope of getting at a fact which would in any way bring to the knowledge of the committee any fraud, corruption, or actual abuse in the Department, the witness was hunted up, no matter where he was, whether in the Department or a discharged employee, or wherever he might be.

Now, it will not do to come before the House at this day and say that the Secretary of the Navy stood in the way of this investigation. After he had been excluded from the committee-room, after his Bureau officers had been excluded from this investigation for a period of four months, while hundreds of witnesses were being examined and their testimony taken, testimony intended to affect directly the integrity and character of the Secretary of the Navy and his Bureau officers, during all that time the seal of secrecy was placed on the lips of the members of the committee, of the official reporter, and of every one admitted inside of the committee-room.

I propose to call attention to a few of the matters contained in the report, a few matters that are charged against the Secretary of the Navy as being violations of law. The first subject to which I shall call attention is the transfer of funds from one Bureau in the Department to another.

In this connection I want to speak for a few moments of the use of the money appropriated for the eight sloops-of-war. The appropriation of \$3,200,000, made by the Forty-second Congress for the special purpose of building eight steam sloops of-war, was used, as the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy shows—used prior to the meeting of the Forty-third Congress, together with every other appropriation made to the Department for that fiscal year—for the purpose of putting our Navy into a condition to meet an exigency that seemed to be upon the country growing out of the *Virginius* affair. The country will remember that affair, will remember that in 1873 the steamer *Virginius* was seized by a Spanish cruiser and American citizens found on board were ruthlessly butchered in cold blood. It aroused a feeling of indignation throughout the whole length and breadth of the land, and

it seemed for a time that a war with Spain was imminent. Our Navy was in no condition to meet the navy of Spain or of any of the great European Powers. The Secretary of the Navy, acting, as he testifies, in the belief that it was his duty as the administrative officer of that Department to prepare for war, did make use of and expend the whole of the appropriation for the eight sloops in preparing the Navy for that exigency. The President of the United States, his Cabinet, every patriotic American citizen, looked to him in his preparations with anxiety, hoping that he might be ready when we were compelled to strike the blow or when the blow should come upon us.

This is one of the "violations of law" to which the attention of the American Congress is called in this report; one of the "violations of law" by the Secretary of the Navy, and perhaps the very gravest upon which the majority of this committee propose, if the Judiciary Committee shall see fit, that he shall be impeached before Congress and the country. Why, Mr. Speaker, if he had not done just what he did in this exigency he would have been derelict in his duty.

More than this, when Congress met in December the condition of this appropriation was brought at once to the attention of Congress. The Secretary came to the Committee on Appropriations and said to them, "I have expended all the money you gave me for the purpose of building these eight sloops-of-war; I have expended all the appropriations made for my Department; I am without money." The committee and the House and the country, responding to his demand, gave him \$4,000,000 in order to replace the appropriation for the eight sloops-of-war as well as continue the force of the different bureaus of the Navy up to the beginning of the next fiscal year. This is one of the matters, I repeat, to which the attention of the country is called in connection with the impeachment of the Secretary of the Navy.

Another matter dwelt upon in the report of the majority is the present condition of the Navy as compared with what it was some years ago. Upon this subject I do not propose to speak further than to call the attention of the House to the rebuilding, as it is termed in the report of the majority, of old vessels under the name of repairs. The conduct on the part of the Secretary is criticised as a violation of law, and the House is to be called upon to impeach him for this conduct.

Now, I desire to state to the House just what this rebuilding of old vessels under the name of repairs spoken of by the majority of the committee consists in. Annually Congress appropriates to the Bureau of Construction and Repair a stipulated sum of money, and the present chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, with the knowledge and consent of the Secretary of the Navy, instead of going to the various navy yards of the country, and using his annual appropriation in the repair of a dozen or more old, rotten, unseaworthy hulks, built of white oak timber which came down to us from the war, sloops and steamers which served their purpose, hastily constructed, some built in less than one hundred days, sent out as cruisers during the war, and which are now almost entirely worthless from defective material used in their construction—I say that instead of using his entire appropriation upon a dozen or a half dozen

of those old vessels, the chief of the Bureau, with the advice and consent of the Secretary, has seen fit to go into the navy yards and take out entirely not only its masts and spars, but its keel from one of those old vessels, replacing them entirely with substantial material, especially of live oak, giving to the Navy each year in this way one good, substantial vessel which will last almost half a century. This is the manner in which the Secretary and the chief of the Bureau have been expending the appropriations for constructions and repairs from year to year. In the judgment of the minority of the committee it is the better economy and wisdom on their part to enter into this sort of rebuilding of a vessel rather than taking out a rotten plank here and there from a number of vessels which are to disappear entirely from the Naval Register in a short time on account of unseaworthiness.

Another matter complained of largely, and upon which two hundred pages of testimony have been taken, is the manner in which labor is put in the various navy yards of the country. It is true now, as it has been for the last half century, that to some extent at least politicians control the labor employed in the various navy yards. Local politicians, notably members of Congress, come to the various chiefs and commandants of the navy yards and others having charge of the employment of labor, and in this way we have no doubt that occasionally an unskilled workman replaces a skilled mechanic.

But, as I said a moment ago, this matter of laboring men, this matter of politics in the navy yards and every department of the Government has existed for half a century. Take the very city of Norfolk, and there is greater complaint made of political influence in the navy yard at Norfolk than any other place in the country. In that very city of Norfolk there is not a single uniformed or ununiformed police officer upon the streets who does not belong to the party known in Virginia as the Conservative party.

Take the city of New York, take the Democratic State governments throughout the length and breadth of the land, and I ask whether the employment of skilled and unskilled labor, the various watchmen about the public buildings of the country, are not employed and put in their places by reason of the fact that they belong to the party in power? This House of Representatives furnishes a notable example of political influence in the employment of subordinates. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk's desk had been filled for twelve years before the Democratic party came into power in this end of the Capitol by a gentleman whose honesty, integrity and great knowledge of the business in which he was engaged made him so eminent (I am speaking now of the Clerk of the last House of Representatives) that his superior as a Clerk was never known in the history of our Government. And yet he was displaced on the very first day of the session. It may be said this is to some extent a political position, and I concede it. I do not complain that the majority put a party friend in that position. It was their right to do it, and no man of any political party of the country expected them to do anything else, and I am gratified to say the present incumbent is in all respects a perfect gentleman. They not only did this, but they went through that office and cleaned it out almost entirely.

They began with the Doorkeeper's department, and they went through that in the same *effective, efficient and thorough manner*. They did not stop even until they got down to the bath-rooms of the House of Representatives and removed from his place an old man who had been there for years and years in charge of the towels and the soap and the baths of the House, and replaced him by a young, vigorous gentleman from some State out West, who was in sympathy with the party in power. So with the post-office of the House, and so with every other place that the party in power in this end of the Capitol could touch. Political influence and political power were felt "all along the lines." And now it does not come with a very good grace from a committee of the House of Representatives in a majority report to complain that in the navy-yards and elsewhere throughout the country the Republican party have yielded to the pressure of political influence, and that the politicians in some instances have directed the employment of labor in the various navy yards.

But I must pass from this subject, and in fact from the entire subject in a few minutes more. I have only time to call attention to these matters in a brief and hurried way. There are many things complained of and magnified largely in the report of the majority; the testimony of witnesses, extreme witnesses, being quoted, and conclusions drawn from their testimony that a fair and full reading of the testimony will in nowise warrant. I have alluded to some of the chief matters of complaint against the Secretary of the Navy. He is charged with conniving at fraud, with being guilty of wrongs against the Government, with having betrayed the great trust reposed in him for the benefit of the whole country, and with having used it for the advancement of his personal friends. These charges are freely made throughout the length and breadth of the report. The matters that I have alluded to are specimens of the charges made, and I take it that upon a full reading of the testimony, if any gentlemen shall ever see fit to read it all, they will learn that the Secretary of the Navy has conducted the affairs of his department in the interest of the whole country; that in the repairs put upon the Navy, that in the use of the different appropriations, and that in the general direction of the Department he has not departed from a line of honesty and faithfulness toward the country.

He has spent seven years in the position of a Cabinet Officer. He is still a young man, and he may well feel proud of the position he occupies and has occupied so honorably for so long a time. Perhaps in the declaration I am about to quote may be found the animus of this report. It is declared in the platform of the St. Louis convention that the Secretary of the Navy has been enriching himself and his friends by selling his offices. I know that the Democratic party of the country are hard-pressed; I know that for eight months almost they have been in session in this end of the Capitol with all the great economic questions of the day lying at their very doors; and they have failed in a session of eight months to bring to the country a single affirmative proposition of any character or kind whatever. There lies the question of our revenues just where you found it; there are the great questions of finance just where you found them; there are the questions of transportation just

where you found them. Has it become necessary in order to go to the country for "Tilden and reform" that you strike down the bureau officers of the Navy Department; that you wound the Secretary of the Navy, and that by this report you place a stigma upon their characters that is not justified by the testimony taken by this committee?

Mr. GARFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address myself only to one point in this report. I see that after seven months of incubation the committee have finally laid an egg out of which they are able to hatch only a doubt.

The result of all their work is that they are in doubt whether the Secretary of the Navy has violated any law or not. Being uncertain whether any living thing can be hatched from that egg, they turn it over to another committee to be set on during the summer, and, if possible, to be hatched next winter. Now the chief point in their report—the Samson of their case, as I understand it—is this: They have examined the testimony and have found what they think in one instance is a violation of the law of the United States. And it is this one allegation of a violation that I rise to speak upon. They quoted to us the statute of June 17, 1844, which is in these words:

That no person shall be employed or continued abroad to receive and pay money for the use of the naval service on foreign stations, whether under contract or otherwise, who has not been, or shall not be, appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. (5 Statutes at Large, page 703.)

This is very broad and sweeping language, and the committee say that in obedience to this statute immediately after its passage the name of Baring Brothers was sent to the Senate and by them confirmed as the foreign fiscal agents of the Navy Department. Then the gentleman turns triumphantly and says there was again a confirmation by the Senate in 1876 of the appointment of Seligmann & Brothers. Why did not the President send to the Senate the name of Jay Cooke, McCulloch & Co., in 1873, to be confirmed in accordance with this law? The gentleman who spoke yesterday [Mr. LEWIS] said that doubtless the Secretary of the Navy refused to send in the name of McCulloch for fear the Senate would have rejected it; and, if so, the Secretary of the Navy would not have a chance to carry out his own purposes. Why was it that no names were sent in between 1844 and 1876? Why was no name sent in during that period of thirty-two years after the passage of the act of 1844? Why was no name sent in during the administration of Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan or Lincoln? Why was no name sent in during Johnson's administration? Your sword is too broad, my friend; it is double-edged and cut both ways, backward and forward. I will answer why no name was sent in. Every man on this floor must know that all civil officers, except judicial officers, whose names go to the Senate for confirmation, must go there upon a commission for four years unless sooner removed. I will tell you why. In 1846, two years before the first four years had expired, the independent-treasury act was passed. That sixth section of that act designates all the persons who shall receive, deposit, transfer and pay the moneys of the United States, and if that section stood alone it would by implication repeal the section I have quoted from the act of 1844.

section entire from the act approved August 6, 1846:

Sec. 6. *And be it further enacted, That the Treasurer of the United States, the treasurer of the Mint of the United States, the treasurers, and those acting as such, of the various branch mints, all collectors of the customs, all surveyors of the customs acting also as collectors, all assistant treasurers, all receivers of public moneys at the several land offices, all postmasters, and all public officers of whatsoever character, be, and they are hereby, required to keep safely, without loaning, using, depositing in banks, or exchanging for other funds than as allowed by this act, all the public money collected by them or otherwise at any time placed in their possession and custody, till the same is ordered by the proper Department or officer of the Government to be transferred or paid out; and when such orders for transfer or payment are received, faithfully and promptly to make the same as directed, and to do and perform all other duties as fiscal agents of the Government which may be imposed by this or any other acts of Congress, or by any regulation of the Treasury Department made in conformity to law; and also to do and perform all acts and duties required by law or by direction of any of the Executive Departments of the Government as agents, for paying pensions or for making any other disbursements which either of the heads of those Departments may be required by law to make and which are of a character to be made by the depositaries hereby constituted, consistently with the other official duties imposed upon them.* (9 Statutes at Large, page 60.)

An examination of the section shows that the old machinery of depositaries and special agents was swept away altogether, and, by implication, this section repealed the section which the committee quoted from the act of 1844. But we are not left to implication. The last section of the act (section 24) actually repeals all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the sub-treasury act. And this repeal seems to have left in the power of the heads of the several Departments to make their own special fiscal arrangements after they have drawn the money for their use, and therefore very naturally and very properly the President did not find it necessary in 1848 to send the name of Baring Brothers to the Senate, nor in 1852, nor in 1856, nor in 1858, nor at any subsequent day. It was understood by the practice of all the administrations that the sub-treasury law substantially superseded all other laws on the subject.

Now, in 1854, Congress, finding that the Secretaries of the several Departments needed more special power in reference to the disbursement of money, a section was put into an appropriation bill in those Democratic days, which gentlemen will find as the fourteenth section of the sundry civil bill of August 4, 1854. And here is the section:

Whenever it becomes necessary for the head of any Department or office to employ special agents other than officers of the Army and Navy, who may be charged with the disbursement of public moneys, such agents shall, before entering upon duty, give bond in such form and with such security as the head of the Department or office employing them may approve.

This section recognizes the power of the Secretary to employ agents, but requires him to take security from them. Now; that act of 1854, together with the section I have quoted from the sub-treasury act, was accepted on all hands as dispensing with the necessity of sending in a name to the Senate for such foreign fiscal agent.

Now, in 1871 a new appointment was made; the appointment of Jay Cooke, McCulloch & Co., after consultations which are usually had

by all Administrations; it is not necessary to discuss the reason of that. They were made the agents of the Government. But were their names sent into the Senate? Of course not; nobody raised the question of practice, because not one of Secretary Robeson's predecessors had sent any name in for nearly one third of a century. And the power of the Secretary was further increased by the act of July 5, 1862, providing that "all appropriations for specific, general and contingent expenses of the Navy Department shall be under the control and expended by the direction of the Secretary of the Navy."

What now happened? When we came to revise the statutes of the United States in 1874, by one of the blunders which the revisers made in so great a work, there was embraced in it the old, obsolete law of 1844. And when that came to be discovered, and there was a change in 1876 in the fiscal agency of the Navy Department, and Seligman Brothers, of New York, were appointed, for the first time in thirty-odd years, it appeared that there was a requirement in the Revised Statutes that the name should be sent to the Senate for confirmation. And accordingly, in obedience to that old, obsolete section now included in the Revised Statutes, the name of Seligman Brothers was sent into the Senate.

And I will say here, what is common report throughout the country, that the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate that had charge of that nomination thought there was no necessity of their ratifying the nomination. It was the general impression that, even with that provision in the Revised Statutes, they did not need to ratify the nomination of Seligman Brothers. But finally, out of abundant caution, they did ratify it.

And now we are called upon to raise the question of impeachment of Secretary Robeson for having neglected a repealed statute, which, for thirty years, every one of his predecessors had treated as repealed. If party rage can go further than that; if malice can seek a crazier thing to lean upon, I do not know what it is.

The doctrine of the majority of the committee is one

That leans its idiot back
On folly's topmost twig.

That is all I have to say on that point.

Now, a word or two on a single other point. It is charged that the Secretary of the Navy made remittances to the concern of Jay Cooke, McCulloch & Co. after it was in a failing condition. Now, it is clearly shown in their own testimony that the remittance was made weeks before the credit of the firm had suffered any shock. The warrant passed out of the Secretary's hands and was no more under his control than under yours or mine. And because some of the drafts, which had been wandering around the world, were not presented for payment till a day or two after the crash, the committee say that therefore the Secretary made remittances after the credit of the firm was impaired. I have only time to say that the action of the Secretary was such as every sensible business man would approve.

I want to say one word in conclusion, and that is this: That good old sense of fair play that enters into the hearts and minds of all brave, manly men requires this House to do one of two things: If you believe that Secretary Robeson has done anything deserving im-

peachment, present your articles and vote on them. If you do not believe that, say so and drop the subject. But to hang up over his head a doubt and a threat, and to let them hang there as a menace during the heated political controversy of the pending election is unmanly and unjust. Why, sir, you might say the same thing of George Washington; you could pass this same resolution about any public servant that the nation ever had. We could say that, being in doubt whether all his acts were perfectly legal, we will turn the question over to a committee to inquire, with instructions to bring in articles if they find any act impeachable. Could you not say that about any man you ever knew who ever held any public office in this nation? Secretary Robeson is a manly man, and does not fear to meet the full responsibility of his official acts.

Now let this House do the manly thing; bring in your articles of impeachment and vote on them; recommit this report to your committee, and let them act upon it and bring in articles of impeachment if they can. We do not desire to screen anybody who has done wrong, but we do demand, manly, fair play.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HALE. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to enter my earnest protest against this partisan attempt to break down an able and honest officer of the Government—to protest against this attempt to utilize the last days of a session preceding a Presidential election by raising a new rallying cry for the canvass over alleged maladministration on the part of a man who seven years ago came to Washington bringing the highest reputation as a good lawyer and an honest man, and who in all unprejudiced minds has sustained that reputation from that day to this; who found a shattered and decayed and almost useless navy, and who put in its place the best by far that the country has ever had; who has been at the head of a Department in which have been spent tens of millions of dollars, and who has never, directly or indirectly, taken one dollar for himself, but who is to-day a poorer man than when seven years ago he resigned the attorney generalship of New Jersey and came to Washington to be Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing this subject I have but little time to give to it, not half that I could wish. Of the hour that is assigned me I shall yield large portions to different gentlemen who have from time to time taken an interest in this investigation, and who have to some extent explored the wide waste of testimony that the committee has thrown open to us. Something of this I have done myself. I have not read all of the testimony, and I propose to confine myself to certain portions of the investigation, the testimony bearing upon which I have faithfully gone through. Human life is too short to read everything that the committee has raked and scraped from the corners of the earth.

But I have read enough to know this, Mr. Speaker, that if anywhere this committee has found any ambitious officer in the navy who believes in the exaltation of his Department into a realm where \$10 will be spent where one is now spent, and who blames the Secretary because he has not scattered money with more lavish hand, it has opened its doors to him. I have read enough to see that if there has been any discharged officer or employee of the Government that has come to Washington or the various places where the committee have sat,

trumpeting his tale of personal wrongs, the committee have reached out their arms and gladly received him. I have read enough to know that if there has been any baffled contractor who has not succeeded in getting his scheme for illicit gain through the Navy Department, and is now disturbed by the memory of profits that he never should have had and has lost, the committee has found him and gladly heard him. I have learned that if there has been living any old officer of the navy who held important place before the rebellion, like ex-Constructor Porter, who had been at Norfolk, who refitted the Merrimac and made her such an engine of destruction to our navy that in the little space of an hour she sunk millions of dollars and most precious lives—I have learned that if the committee found any such as he, they opened their doors to him, and gave him welcome, and made him sit in all the high places that their report erects. They listened to and set down all his complaints, embittered as they were by the reflection on his part of the day when, under the Democratic party, he was a power in the Navy Department. I have learned that if throughout the length of the Atlantic coast there has been any "dead beat" who has been kicked from the doors of the Navy Department, the committee has invited him and has taken his testimony, and that wherever, as in the case of the man Wolfe, he has been contradicted by witness upon witness piling up contradiction, Osso upon Pelion, the report of the committee has been made upon the testimony of the "dead-beat," and that nowhere in the report is to be found the countervailing testimony of the honest witnesses. So much I have learned by reading this report so far as I have been able to give time to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim to know something of the American Navy and of its management and condition in the last seven years. In the Forty-first Congress I had the honor to serve upon the Naval Committee.

In the two succeeding Congresses I served upon the Committee on Appropriations. I had charge of all naval appropriations. Such experience ought to have given me some knowledge of the operations of the Department, some views as to the management of the Secretary of the Navy during these years.

I wish to give about all my time to the consideration of the real condition of the American Navy as it now is in contrast with what it was when Mr. Robeson took charge of it, for the heaviest charge in the complaint of the majority of the committee is that the Secretary has wantonly and perhaps corruptly wasted the immense sums of money that have been put by Congress at his disposal, and that little or nothing can be shown for it; that there is presented in these seven years a wilderness of extravagance, corruption and fraud. When the Secretary took the Department in 1869 he had everything to learn. He set himself to learn it. He inherited almost everything but a good Navy. He inherited a Department used to extravagant expenditures of money during all the years of the war. He has suffered with certain naval officers because his term of office has been at a time when Congress and the people demanded that there should be lessening of expenditure, a policy never acceptable with the officers of the Navy. He inherited a service the spirit of whose officers was high and who believed that

the American Navy should be increased until it should compare with the navies of great European powers where a pound sterling is spent where we spend a dollar. Above all, Mr. Speaker, he inherited a Navy with ships which were ships only in name; their hulls were decayed, their engines were worthless. With many of them speed was a myth. With others to float even was as impossible as for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven.

There were at that time, Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary took charge of this Department, but eighteen ships in all that were suitable for sea-service. This fact the gentlemen who father this remarkable majority report either have not learned or have ignored entirely. But such is the fact. Out of all the expenditure of the war, the Navy having been run in that period like a race-horse to win a particular race at no matter what the future sacrifice should be, Mr. Robeson, when he came into office, had but eighteen ships fit for sea-service. We had never run so low since Mr. Jefferson's mania for little gun-boats and a dismantled Navy. Now to-day there are eighty ships, including iron-clads in good condition and fit for service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of these eighty ships, forty-seven have been extensively repaired and rebuilt in the last five years. They have been built and repaired out of appropriations given by Congress to the Secretary. There is one thing which I have failed to see credit given for in this report to the Secretary of the Navy, in which he stands alone, and that is, that in all these years, whatever the appropriations of Congress have been, he has confined himself rigidly to them. There have been no deficiency bills, Mr. Speaker, in the Secretary of the Navy's Department, and he has brought up this little dwindled navy of eighteen vessels, out of the appropriations Congress has given him, to a navy of eighty good vessels, fit for sea and for defense.

And for this the gentlemen on the majority of the committee would impeach him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

What would they have done, I wonder, if the Secretary had supinely allowed the American Navy to go to destruction and had really nothing to show for his money?

One of the charges made is as to the rebuilding of vessels out of the appropriations for construction and repair. Yes, the Secretary has done it. He does not deny it. He is proud of it; and, as an advocate and friend of the American Navy, I am proud of it. He has built out of the appropriation for construction and repair ten vessels which are to-day as good as new.

But, while the committee have found that fact, they have not found the further fact that the Secretary has followed the example of every administration for thirty years. Do gentlemen know that there were built in this same way the United States in 1850, the Fulton in 1835, the Engineer in 1835, the Princeton in 1851, the Constitution in 1852, the Constellation in 1853, the Congress in 1840, the Macedonian in 1852 and the Franklin in 1854; built from keel inclusive upward, only retaining the old name, just as Secretary Robeson built the Marion, the Vandalia, the Swatara, the Galena, the Nipsic, and has almost finished the Miantonomoh, the Amphitrite, the Monadnock, the Terror and the Puritan?

He followed in the beaten track of his pre-

decessors. Nay, has this committee ever found out that there were built outright in 1843, without authority of Congress, from the general appropriations, the following new vessels, new in name as well as in keel and hull: the Portsmouth, the Germantown, the Albany, the Plymouth, the Saint Mary's, and the Jamestown? These were added to the lists of the Navy by the administration in the year 1843. And because the Secretary has gone half as far as previous Democratic administrations, the majority of this committee want to impeach him.

Let me call the attention of gentlemen to some of the results of this good conduct on the part of the Secretary in building up a good Navy, which I say to-day, and I say it on the responsibility of knowledge, is a better Navy than the Republic has ever had. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] has referred to the Virginius excitement. Has he learned that because the Secretary of the Navy then summoned to the waters of the Gulf a fleet so efficient Spain did not dare herself to enter into the conflict, war was averted? Does he know that at that time Spain herself had an armament there that was larger than any which Howe or St. Vincent ever commanded; larger than the fleet with which Nelson won his coronet at the Nile or with which he broke the power of France and Spain at Trafalgar; and that, immense as that armament was, as frowning and portentous as was the appearance in the sky at that time, the Secretary of the Navy, whom you now want to impeach, sent into the very teeth of the guns of the Spanish vessels a force so efficient that we were protected and that hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands of valuable lives were saved? Why, sir, we owed more at that time to the course of the Secretary of the Navy that war was averted than to any and everybody else, as good as the diplomacy of the time was.

The gentlemen of the majority, I see, in their report contrast this Navy unfavorably with the Navy at the close of Mr. Buchanan's administration, and they contrast the expenditures. Why, sir, the administration of Mr. Buchanan in its four years had annual appropriations for the Navy of from eleven to fourteen millions of dollars, appropriations that would buy more of material and labor than the corresponding appropriations in any of the years that Secretary Robeson has been the head of the Department. And yet, sir, when the war broke out the Navy was not in a condition to fire a gun in defense of the flag.

Let me call the attention of those three gentlemen, from Tennessee and Texas and Alabama, who have been foremost in this matter in arraigning the Secretary, to the possible results had Mr. Robeson's navy under his management been on the seas in 1861. Had his fourteen iron-clads been ready for service then as they are now, we would have had one stationed at Memphis, and there would not have been the condition of affairs in Tennessee that you saw there at that time. We would have had one in Galveston, and Texas would not have been so rampant as you, sir, [looking at Mr. MILLS,] helped to make it that year. We would have had one at Mobile, and Alabama wouldn't have been so eager to go into secession. We would have had one or two at Norfolk, and others at Charleston and at Savannah and at Wilmington and at Baltimore, and the rebel-

lion would have been throttled and these gentlemen that now want to impeach a Cabinet officer because he has made a good navy for the Republic would perhaps have never gained the reputation in the field that has sent them onto this floor. Or, if I may be more charitable, in the peaceful times that would have ensued, these gentlemen from Alabama and Texas and Tennessee would have decorated this Chamber with their presence earlier than they now have.

Other results would have followed if we had had a Secretary like the present one in the years preceding the war. We would not have had so heavy a debt as we have now. There would not have been so many pensions. There would not have been such a war debt, and such a debt incidentally from the war. And my Democratic friends would not have had so large a margin to figure from in making their reductions.

No, sir. The fact is that upon this subject the record of the Secretary of the Navy is resplendent with his achievements in building up this branch of the service. And the gentlemen of the majority of the committee have gone out delving in the highways and the byways, and have found a canteen man at Brooklyn that took interest in the navy, and they have found that a board was put into the Secretary's dumb-waiter, and that a baptismal font and a sideboard were made, all of which the Secretary paid for at high prices out of his own money, and henceforth got his furniture at cheaper prices; they have hunted up old constructor John Porter, who has filled their pages with his bitter complaints and talk about the enormities of the present administration in the navy yards, and they complain that men at the navy yards vote the Republican ticket on compulsion.

As an illustration of this subject I ask that the following letter be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMANDANT'S OFFICE, NAVY YARD, }
MARE ISLAND, September 23, 1858. }

SIR: Mr. Turner, civil engineer, objects to a requisition for a sawyer to superintend the saw-mill without its going through his office, and further states that the saw-mill is under the immediate charge of the master joiner.

I have also heard that the man selected by you is a black Republican; if so, he cannot be admitted on the rolls of this yard *while I command it*.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. B. CUNNINGHAM, *Commandant*.

I. HANSCOM, ESQ., *Naval Constructor, Navy Yard, Mare Island, California.*

Mr. HALE. That is better, Mr. Speaker, than any argument of mine. It shows that while abuses exist in this direction, they have come down from former years.

Mr. Speaker, in what I have said I have dealt mainly with the condition of the American navy, because that is at the bottom of the question. I say here, and I can maintain it, that the Secretary of the Navy has built out of the ordinary appropriations of the Republic the best navy that the country has ever had, and for this the gentlemen of the majority of this report would forsooth impeach him!

Truly, republics are ungrateful, and never more so when the question whether praise or blame shall be meted out rests with the majority of the present Committee on Naval Affairs.

I now yield fifteen minutes to my colleague, [Mr. FRYE.]

Mr. FRYE. I do not know that I need any

excuse for addressing this House for fifteen minutes, and yet as I have no connection with the Naval Committee perhaps it is just for me to say that, as a member of this House, as a lawyer, as a gentleman careful and sensitive as to the honor of the Secretary of the Navy, a gentleman whom I have known long, known well, and whom before this investigation commenced I believed to be a man of as strict integrity, of as noble purposes, of as generous impulses as any man within the circle of my acquaintance, I have studiously and critically examined this evidence, and I beg to say to the House from the examination I have made of the testimony, from the discussion which has taken place on the floor of this House, I state on my honor as a member that my opinion has not been changed as to the Secretary of the Navy one jot or one tittle. Sir, there are periods in the history of the world when darkness usurps the place of light, as the spots now and then appear upon the face of the moon; when justice is dethroned and tyranny is enthroned; when the possession of virtue, of purity, and integrity only lead to an attack and persecution upon the possessor; when suspicion secures conviction, while evidence fails; when father is against son and brother against brother; and the members of one's own household are spies upon him and his family; times when hell seems to reign and heaven to serve. History repeats itself, and if ever one of those dark periods of time was repeated in the history of the American Congress it has been during this present session.

Why, sir, it has been bitter, it has been full of suspicion, it has been full of crimination and recrimination; all social intercourse has been embittered by it, and why? Because a great party of the country, hungry and thirsty by an abstinence of a score of years, thought that it saw the flesh-pots of Egypt and was bound to taste thereof. Ah! gentlemen, you have gone too far; you may get a view of the promised land, but you cut off your prospect of ever reaching it by too fond a desire for an indulgence in flesh-pots. Sir, why is it that scores of committees of this House for the last seven months, at a cost to the people of \$3,000 a day, clothed with the power of sending for persons and papers, armed with subpoenas, sitting with closed doors, have sent these subpoenas into the slime and the alleys and the lanes of great cities; have brought in the drunkards, the insane men, the discharged employees, and disgraced officials, and everything that was debased and wicked, and, sitting with closed doors, have taken from their lips that filth they were willing and delighted to dispense, and from time to time have scattered it through a partisan press? Only because the necessities of the party seem to require it.

Why is it that the Naval Committee listen to the story of Porter, who as naval constructor at Norfolk fitted out the Merrimac, violated his oath, destroyed vessels sailing under the American flag, and finds false measurements of timber in that yard, though a dozen loyal men flatly contradict him? The necessities of the party demand it.

Why is it that the testimony of the drunken Wolfe, the discharged employee, almost in *delirium* when he testified, is believed against the contradicting statements of five respectable and credible witnesses? The necessities of the party demand it.

Why is it that the Committee on the Real

Estate Pool Ring was empowered by this House to investigate every man and everything under the wide heavens, and in pursuance of that purpose dared to violate the sanctity of private business letters and telegrams, to send to the vats of paper-makers and bring such telegrams here by the half ton and spend months sorting over this private correspondence of private gentlemen, disgracing themselves and outraging the American Congress? Ah! because the necessities of the party seemed to require it.

Why is it that a dignified committee like that on the judiciary is parceled out into squads of detectives, and, notwithstanding their dignity, compelled to prowl around among discharged employees of the Treasury Department, among disgraced officials, among whisky-ring-convicts, seeking to prove that the great executive head of the United States, too, has been dabbling in whisky frauds? Why would that committee dare to drag in the mire the great name of this great Republic before the eyes of the whole world? There is but one answer: The necessities of the party seemed to require it.

Why, when a member of this House was charged with selling a cadetship for \$3,000, did the sub-committee of the Judiciary spend months upon the case; and then when they found that there was not a scintilla of evidence against their colleague and their peer on the floor of this House, and were compelled to report his exculpation, why, I say, did they in six of the pages of that exculpation report seek to cover him with the infamy of gross and wicked suspicions; that report never signed or voted for by but four members of the committee, while the minority report which I have in my desk, and which fully and completely exculpates the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. HAYS,] is signed by five members of that committee?

Why did the same committee demand the private correspondence of a distinguished member of this House, in no manner relating to the case in hand; and when it was refused, why did the partisan press fill the public mind with gross and wicked suspicion, until in self-defense that gentleman was compelled to read the letters to forty millions of people? The necessities of a great party demanded it.

And so I might go on by the hour, but I have only fifteen minutes. I now put the same question to the House and to the country as to this Committee on Naval Affairs. Why did you sit with closed doors for months, taking four thousand printed pages of testimony? Why did you close the mouths of the Republican members of that committee, so that they could not make any inquiry to obtain information in relation to this examination? And when you had got through your taking of testimony, why did you make this report, for which there is no foundation in the evidence from its beginning down to its very end?

Why did the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. LEWIS] yesterday and why did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] to-day assert what they did assert in regard to the Cattell performance, or the "Cattellism," as they termed it? Why did the gentleman from Texas assert that E. G. Cattell testified that he expended \$13,000 for Secretary Robeson upon a palace at Long Branch, when the gentleman from Texas knew as well as I know, because I have read the testimony, that E. G. Cattell was acting as the agent of A. J. Cattell, an ex-Sena-

tor of the United States, and then absent, by virtue of an agreement with him? And he knew further that the Secretary of the Navy had mortgaged or deeded property in the city of Washington of three times the value of the whole amount as security to A. G. Cattell & Co. for the advances which had been made. Why was the gentleman silent as to that? Ah! the necessities of the party demanded it.

Why did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] read the income returns of the Secretary of the Navy from 1866 to 1869, when he knew as well as I know it, but was silent about it, that the Secretary of the Navy in 1866 paid an income tax on \$76,000, a tax of over \$7,000, and which the gentleman from Texas knew would be allowed the next year to the payer of the tax, and deducted from the tax of that year? Why did he make these statements when the Secretary of the Navy himself testified, uncontradicted, that he had been compelled to sell \$20,000 of United States bonds to keep his position here in the city of Washington, and that all he was worth to-day more than he was worth the day he became Secretary of the Navy came from rise in property? Why did he not say, as is proven in the case, that the account books of A. G. Cattell & Co. contained every item charged against Mr. Robeson?

Now what is it about the Cattells. A. G. Cattell, ex-United States Senator, was for twenty years the friend of the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy was the attorney and counsel for A. G. Cattell & Co. for ten years before he became the Secretary of the Navy; hence all these business transactions between them. Now I submit to this House—for I have not time to examine the evidence, and I ask them to examine this testimony for themselves—that they cannot find one scintilla of evidence from the beginning to the end of it which connects the Secretary of the Navy in the remotest degree either with selling his influence to contractors, or with receiving one dollar of benefit from them.

On the contrary, it will be found that the Secretary of the Navy himself testified before the committee that he never received one dollar from any contractor or for any contract; that when he heard by public rumor that E. G. Cattell was endeavoring to sell his influence with the Department, he, the Secretary of the Navy, immediately went to Philadelphia and informed the party in charge there that no such thing would be allowed for a moment. E. G. Cattell testified that the Secretary was kept in profound ignorance of the facts, as was his brother, A. G. Cattell, so far as it could be done.

Roach and other contractors, two in number, testified that the Secretary of the Navy told them that under no circumstances should they pay a dollar or a cent to E. G. Cattell or any other man in order to procure contracts; that if he knew of it the contracts would not be granted. Where is the evidence that the Secretary was knowing to this commission business? There is not one word in the whole four thousand pages of testimony.

Then, again, the Secretary himself testifies distinctly and squarely that he never extended favor to E. G. Cattell or to any other contractor or to any other purchaser of supplies whatsoever; and I have here a

LIST OF TWENTY-THREE LEADING OFFICERS

of the navy whom he called as witnesses, all of them having served from twenty-five to forty-five years, and every one of them having been in positions as commissaries, quartermasters, &c., where they had the right legally to purchase supplies for periods covering the whole time that Mr. Robeson has been Secretary of the Navy, and every one of them to a man testifies that there never was any request for favor on the part of the Secretary of the Navy; that there never was any favor extended by them; that he never, directly or indirectly, asked them to extend favor to any living contractor or furnishing man. Why does the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. MILLS,] why do the majority of the Naval Committee disregard all this testimony and in their report never mention it all, but go entirely upon suspicions of their own? The necessities of the party demand it.

"O," it is said, "the Secretary must have got money improperly, because this Cattell sold his influence." Gentlemen, do you not know that your influence and your votes are sold every day that you sit on the floor of this House? Do you not know that brokers and lobbyists in Washington and New York are selling the votes of the very best of you every day that you live? Do you not know that they sold the vote of Hon. William Pitt Fessenden for a thousand dollars—a man who could not be corrupted by all the money in the world; whose ever-enduring monument is that he dared to stand up in the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson and vote "not guilty" against his whole party? And yet, do you dare assume that he was corrupt? Do you assume that Congress is corrupt? Do you assume that the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, is corrupt because some miserable scoundrel sells influence with him that he never had, and his vote which he could never control? E. G. Cattell did this, and nothing more than this; yet the majority of the Naval Committee find that Mr. Robeson is corrupt because—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HALE. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. KELLEY.]

Mr. KELLEY.—Mr. Speaker, I grieve as sincerely as any man in this House over the character of this report. It is a sad disappointment to me. There are abuses, traditional abuses, in many departments of the Government; and I hoped that we should get a calm, philosophic arraignment of these and proposed amendments in the law which would remedy and avert them. But this report is so superficial and bitterly partisan that it must be a disappointment to the whole country. It brings forward no amendments to the law; it proposes to remedy no evil; but in lieu of such practical suggestions it proposes to refer to another committee of the House a mass of four thousand pages of loose and incoherent testimony, much of it from disreputable sources, in order that that committee may discover whether George M. Robeson, Secretary of the Navy, has been guilty of any crime or misdemeanor. Stultifying itself, the Naval Committee in this proposition declares that in seven months it has not been able to discover such a fact, and asks that the Judiciary Committee may sit at least till after the November election upon the question and ascertain whether

it can discover any in this mass of worse than hearsay evidence.

I have known Mr. Robeson, in the little city in which he grew to manhood and has practiced law, for more than a quarter of a century, and I aver that in an inquisition made in open daylight, where the safeguards of character established by tradition, law or decency should be respected, the world may investigate him, and his integrity will come out without taint or tarnish. What, with strumpets and thieves and their consorts examined in the darkness, sworn not to reveal what they had testified to, with even the minority of the committee bound to the secrecy of the Spanish inquisition, what taint you may have put upon the name of an honorable man, I know not; but when the American people know your methods and look at your flimsy partisan results, they will discard your report as I do, as a mere electioneering document made at the expense of the character of our country and institutions.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate on behalf of the minority of the Committee on Naval Affairs I shall endeavor to confine myself to those subjects which the majority bring to our attention as the result and conclusions of their investigation.

I have always protested that the purpose and the apparent attempt of our committee was to hunt up if possible some ground upon which to make a charge against the Secretary of the Navy. I have felt so, Mr. Speaker. I have believed so. And now, at last the result of all which comes before this House of Representatives, the result of all our investigations, which this House is called to pass upon, is this: Will this House send to another committee of this body this vast accumulation of trash called testimony, and the conundrums which the committee seem to raise upon questions of law? Shall we send all this to another great committee of this House to find out whether possibly there may not be discovered from all this testimony a legal or technical ground upon which to charge the Secretary with high crimes and misdemeanors and to render it proper that articles of impeachment should be brought in here?

Mr. Speaker, when the committee itself, organized as it has been, controlled as it has been, wielded as it has been in the direction of impeachment, makes the report it does, it is a humiliating confession.

But, sir, what is the use of talking about a fair investigation when the man and the men most affected can only know what transpired in the tribunal which was trying them after the press of the country had put it before them? Remember, Mr. Speaker, the investigation at Norfolk, the investigation at the Washington navy yard, the investigations at the Philadelphia navy yard, at New York, at Boston and at Kittery were all completed and the summer had come upon us before the Secretary was allowed to put his foot in the committee-room. It was not, sir, until the first day of June that he came there. And then, as we have said in our report, he demanded that as a right which the committee had denied him for so long. When, sir, any man holding the relation which he holds to the Government is to be put on trial for high crimes and misdemeanors, it would seem to be a part of his right at least to meet face to face and to put the test of cross-examination to those witnesses who were brought to impeach his honor and integrity.

And yet, sir, the report of this committee stands upon the testimony of a class of witnesses who were never cross-examined; their private history unknown; their motives were unknown. I think the House will see that this is an imposition, a slander upon justice, to say that such an investigation can be fair. It is utterly impossible, however much the parties conducting it intended to make it so, that it should have been fair or impartial.

But my time is rapidly wasting and I want to call the attention of the House to the question before it directly. They say that the Secretary has willingly and corruptly violated certain laws and that for the violation of those laws he ought to be impeached. Now, Mr. Speaker, a great officer like the Secretary of the Navy must necessarily be allowed to construe the law where it has not already been construed for him. He who undertakes to discharge the great trust confided to him must himself construe the law. If, on the other hand, there is a question as to what the law is, he may go to precedents and to history for a guide; but if he makes an honest attempt to execute the law as he understands it, he cannot be impeached, thank Heaven, in this country at least, even if he errs in his conclusions. Were it otherwise, every judge upon the bench might be impeached for some wrong interpretation of the law; and the Secretary of the Navy has the right to ascertain from the statute what the law is and what are his duties under the law; and, if he honestly endeavors to execute the laws as he understands them, he cannot be impeached.

Here is the law which he is charged with violating:

All claims and demands whatever by the United States or against them, and all accounts whatever in which the United States are concerned, either as debtors or as creditors, shall be settled and adjusted in the Department of the Treasury.

It is said that the Secretary of the Navy violated the law in that he paid a certain claim known as the Hungerford claim.

Mr. Speaker, the Hungerford claim was adjusted and settled in the Department of the Secretary of the Treasury. How could the money ever be paid out except that it was adjusted there? There is an absolute and complete compliance with the law, and if the Secretary of the Navy unlawfully passed the claim, it was passed by the Secretary of the Treasury; it was settled or it would not have been paid.

But what of the Hungerford claim? Mr. Hungerford owned a large establishment on the Mississippi river during the war, which was taken from him by the forces of the United States. The value of the property was said to amount to \$230,000. A portion of the materials from the establishment was transferred by the Naval Department to Mound City for the establishment of a naval rendezvous.

Mr. Hungerford never received a dollar for that property then taken, and a portion of it was a claim against the Navy Department. Whatever else this committee may say, they will not undertake to say that this was not an honest debt against the Government of the United States. After examination by the Department the Secretary of the Navy determined that it was his right to pay for these things which the Navy Department had used, and he ordered the payment of \$75,000.

Now I suppose that gentlemen will admit that when the Government takes from a loyal citizen his property, it takes it leaving behind an implied promise to pay for it. Mr. Hungerford has been paid this \$75,000, but there is some money yet due him. A certain lawyer in Washington came before the committee and complained that the Secretary of the Navy would not re-open the case and pay the balance due. The Secretary of the Navy brought forward a receipt in full for the whole claim. The Secretary of the Navy has been abused because he would not re-open that claim and pay the balance, and we had before our committee witnesses after witnesses charging the Secretary with wrong and injustice because he would not re-open that claim and pay more on it.

I come now to the next item in the so-called indictment. By section 1538 of the Revised Statutes it is provided that "no more than \$3,000 shall be expended in any navy yard in repairing the hull and spars of any vessel until the necessity and expediency of such repairs and the probable cost thereof are ascertained and reported to the Navy Department by an examining board." One of the grave accusations made against the Secretary of the Navy is that he has rebuilt the navy without reference to that law.

I also desire to call the attention of the House to the facts that while the Secretary of the Navy is denounced in this report for having brought into the navy ships unlawfully and in violation of that law, he has also been guilty of suffering the American navy to go to decay.

Will the American public hold him guilty of crime in rebuilding its decaying navy and, as the committee does, denounce him for not having a larger navy? I think not.

The Secretary of the Navy claims that in 1862, or thereabouts, I do not remember the exact time, for the purpose of preventing the improper and improvident building and repair of vessels in the navy yards of the United States by the commandants and other officials in charge, Congress was appealed to to prevent such expenditures without express authority of the Navy Department. It is claimed by the Secretary of the Navy that under that action of Congress no officers of a navy yard would have authority to spend more than \$3,000. But he denies, and I appeal to the House to say whether that denial is not well founded, that Congress intended to limit the power of the President of the United States to make and maintain a navy for the country.

The President of the United States gives the authority to the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary is but the hands of the President. The President is clothed with all the power over the Navy; he is the Commander-in-Chief of the armies and navies of the United States. By section 417 of the Revised Statutes it is provided that—

The Secretary of the Navy shall execute such orders as he shall receive from the President relative to the procurement of naval stores and materials, and the construction, armament, equipment and employment of vessels of war, as well as of other matters connected with the naval establishment.

What has he done? Let me call attention for a moment to the first report made by him soon after he entered upon his official duties. On page 12 of that report he says:

Yet we have not at this time on any foreign

station a squadron whose combined force would avail for a day against the powerful sea-going iron-clads which both France and England have upon such stations. These are not agreeable facts for contemplation or to state; but after giving the subject much investigation and reflection I have felt it my duty to state the truth frankly to you.

And mark it, from that hour until this, Congress has not passed a law, has not made an appropriation to build a ship of war of the class here referred to. The only appropriation which the honorable Secretary of the Navy has had at his command, given to him by Congress, was an appropriation of about \$4,000,000 to build eight sloops of war of not more than nine hundred tons burden each, and two torpedo boats. And yet, in the face of this a great committee of the House of Representatives can come now and say to the people of the country, "Behold! the Secretary of the Navy has suffered our fleet to go to decay and our honor to be tarnished in that he has neglected to put upon the seas ships of war equal to those of the other great naval powers of the world."

Now what are the facts? I will not refer to it in detail, for I have not time; but I will refer to the fact that he has rebuilt fifteen iron-clads, which, when he came into office, could not float or fire a gun; they have been brought into good fighting condition. What else has he done? There were our great double-turreted monitors, built of white oak, and therefore going rapidly to decay, and had to be abandoned or repaired.

What has he seen fit to do? He has seen fit to take from the annual appropriations for constructions and repairs—nobody will deny it; it has been taken directly from the appropriations for constructions and repairs—he has seen fit to take money from this source and save those vessels from going out of the navy and out of the service, by putting them into new frames of live oak and rebuilding their decks of iron. They are not now complete; but Admiral Porter, who is always cited by the committee when he criticises the Department of the Navy, says that that was a wise measure; that otherwise those vessels would have been lost to the service. He has put in good condition all the vessels of the navy, with the exception of fourteen; and he has done it out of the appropriations for constructions and repairs, for yards and docks, for ordnance and steam engineering, and any other statement, by whomsoever made, is utterly without foundation, as I understand the testimony.

But the complaint is made that the Secretary of the Navy has rebuilt ships. Will any gentleman on this floor tell me how can you repair a ship of white-oak frame if your frame is rotten? How can you repair an iron-clad monitor with a white-oak frame unless you begin at the keel and build her up with live oak? That is what the Secretary of the Navy has done with reference to these great monitors and other valuable ships.

But, sir, the Secretary is charged with crime in having bartered and exchanged certain material; and it is claimed also that, having bartered and exchanged this material, he has not made returns according to law; that in this he has violated the law and is liable to impeachment. This is the construction put upon the matter by the committee. What are the facts? Everywhere throughout the report, everywhere throughout the testimony, it will be

observed that the subject of barter and exchange on the part of the Secretary of the Navy makes a prominent figure. What is the matter of barter and exchange? Why, sir, the Secretary of the Navy has undertaken to rebuild certain iron-clads, and in rebuilding them large quantities of iron became necessary. Under the law he is authorized to sell such vessels as are not valuable and such material as in his judgment cannot be used. Now, Mr. Speaker, old iron taken from ships of war had accumulated in the scrap heaps of the Navy Department. Every person in this House must recognize the fact that large quantities must have accumulated at the close of the war and since. The Secretary saw fit to make a contract with John Roach and other similar manufacturers to take the old iron of the Government in all forms and shapes—old beams, old chains, old plates—everything which the Government had to dispose of, to take this old iron to their manufactories and reroll it into forms adapted to the new iron-clads, delivering to the Government new iron suitable for the wants of the naval constructors, at the rate of one pound of new iron for three pounds of old.

But it is said this is a sale; that in point of fact it is a sale and the Secretary of the Navy has violated the law which provides that he shall sell at public sale such material. It is a barter of material, and therefore a sale, and the Secretary of the Navy has violated the law.

I might spend some time in discussing this question, but I submit to the House if the Secretary of the Navy has the right to rework a pound of old material, and if he cannot do it in the Government navy yard, he must find some one who can do it. And the Government of the United States, to its shame be it said, has neglected the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy made to a former Congress, and it has no establishment in the country of sufficient power and with sufficient machinery to rework its old material. The Secretary of the Navy has therefore seen fit to re-appropriate it in this way. Shall he be held for crime and violation of law in doing this act?

But it is said he violated the law in not making returns of this old iron. The answer is he has sold none. It is further said that this old iron cost \$20,000,000, and that therefore this is a great outrage. Yet the Secretary of the Navy and the heads of the Department have laid before the committee evidence uncontradicted that its whole value was less than \$1,000,000 in market the day he put his hand to it to rework it and reroll it.

It is said there has been misappropriation of funds. That charge I deny. I here inquire where in the whole scope of the testimony can be found the fact that one dollar of appropriation has been permanently taken from its proper Bureau and given to another? Except one—where?

Why, my friends on the other side do not give the Secretary of the Navy credit for any honesty. He does not seem to have any showing or standing. Nothing excuses him. No noble act, no heroic act, no act showing his love for the flag and the country protects him against the findings of this committee.

There is nothing else of misappropriation except one. In the fall of 1873 the Virginius excitement came upon the country, and the Secretary of the Navy spent all his appropriation to get the navy into a condition of defense.

He came before the succeeding Congress and declared the fact, declared it to the country, declared it to the world, and asked the Congress of the United States to approve his conduct in that respect, and it responded with an appropriation of \$4,000,000. And I say, Mr. Speaker, in any Congress of the United States where justice and fair play prevailed, it would be said on that matter, the account is closed; that the American people had settled it; that it had met with the approval of all.

Again, during the last fall, when the cloud of war with Spain looked threatening, at the command of the President he expended much money in preparation, and thus made himself short of means, which would otherwise have been at his command to meet the ordinary current expenses of the year, and to pay on contracts for furnishing the iron-clads. This, too, the country approved.

I am told by my colleague [Mr. HOAR] that it is a thing which the ministry of England would have done and have done a hundred times. Then should George M. Robeson, Secretary of the Navy, be indicted for high crimes and misdemeanors for doing that which the interests of the country demanded, which the honor of the flag demanded, which the Congress of the United States and the American people have approved? Is it not a little late for the Committee on Naval Affairs to undertake to drag into the highest court of the country Mr. Robeson for this act?

I desire here to call the attention of the House to a fact in relation to the transactions of the Secretary with the London house of Jay Cooke, McCulloch & Co., which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] from want of time probably omitted to state. It is this: that so careful and faithful was he to the interests of his country that he took such ample security for all advances that not one dollar will be lost to the Treasury. He should, amid all this criminality and abuse, have ample and full credit for every good and wise act, and this should not be omitted.

Mr. Speaker, as I have promised a few minutes of my time to other gentlemen, I must omit some of the items of this indictment, and come to the end.

But before concluding I desire to say that while the committee charged with the duty of finding high crimes and misdemeanors against Mr. George M. Robeson have spent seven months in trying to do it, they come at last to the melancholy confession that they are not able upon the law, or testimony either, to find that fact. They now say perhaps another committee of the House may be able to find it. By the adoption of the resolution of the majority it has shown that while "willing to wound it was yet afraid to strike."

I yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. KASSON.]

Mr. KASSON. I ask the Clerk to read from the last page of the report of the majority of the committee the clause I have marked.

The Clerk read as follows:

Your committee do not hesitate to recommend that all officers of the navy who have been connected with any of the frauds and corruptions disclosed by this investigation shall be brought to speedy trial before a court-martial, with a view that if unjustly charged they may be vindicated, and that if guilty they may be speedily and vigorously punished and the service relieved; yet they do find in the case of the Secretary some embarrassment in recommending what shall be the

measure and manner of his punishment, arising from the present condition of the law, as viewed by at least a portion of your committee.

Mr. KASSON. I call the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, to that part of the report just read, which has been overlooked, so far as I know, by the gentlemen who have hitherto spoken. And I desire their attention to it in connection with the resolution with which the report closes, and upon which it is proposed this House shall vote. That resolution fails to ask the House to vote a censure; fails to ask the House to impeach; fails to find the officers guilty; fails to find the Secretary guilty; fails of everything with which it is customary to close a report upon investigation of a department or upon the conduct of an official. It evades the entire responsibility which points to one man as the object of punishment, or to one law as the object of repeal.

I am going to appeal to the gentlemen upon the floor of this House upon a point of national honor and of personal character. The instinct of every honorable member rebels against an insinuated dishonor upon the reputation of a gentleman of his acquaintance. You withdraw from it in disgust as from an act of cowardice. When you say, suggestively and whisperingly, if such a man did so and so he ought to be punished, while you dare not openly make the charge, you dishonor yourself. When you say of George M. Robeson, we cannot say whether he has been guilty, or what he has been guilty of, or for what he shall be punished, but recommend that the suspicions be referred to another committee, who are to go over four thousand printed pages of your report, the work of seven months, and instruct them to inquire whether they cannot find that he has been guilty of some offense for which he may be punished, I affirm that it is an evasion, and that you are guilty of conduct toward a gentleman, a public officer of your acquaintance, which you would scorn and spurn from you if it were attempted to be perpetrated upon yourselves. Not only that, sir, but you leave by the language of your report which the Clerk has read the floating cloud of dishonor over the whole corps of gallant officers of our navy, without specifying a name upon which the cloud can rest. Do you mean the brilliant officers who gallantly sailed up the harbor of Mobile and there restored our flag? Do you mean the heroes who so gallantly broke the chain of fire before New Orleans? Whom do you mean to insult and wound by the indefinite, calumnious language which I have had read at the Clerk's desk? Who is it that has dishonored that country's service to which his honor was pledged? Who is it of whom you say that if he is not guilty he ought to be indicted, and if guilty he ought to be punished?

Sir, I stand here in defense of the honor of that navy, I care not who assails it. You are insulting the flag of your country and the honor of the men who have rendered it glorious at home and abroad on all the seas of the world. I appeal again to gentlemen, not politicians; and I ask if this is honorable conduct toward those upon whom you confidently depend for defense against foreign aggressors and to maintain the honor of the flag and the country at the peril of their own honor and their lives?

WE CAN BE JUST AND YET BE GENEROUS.

Mr. HARDENBERGH. Mr. Speaker, the

scene now being enacted in the drama of history in this Representative Hall of the nation is strange and sad. To the citizens of New Jersey it is clothed with intensest interest. * * * We are near the close of a long and laborious session. Eight months of legislation have almost passed, and its closing hours must bear witness to the honor or dishonor of a citizen of New Jersey, who for seven years past has sat in Cabinet councils as the head of the Naval Department and an adviser of the nation's Chief Executive. * * * The investigation has been long, tedious and exhaustive, extending over seven months. The results of that investigation are undecided. On the one hand the House is asked to instruct its Committee on the Judiciary to ascertain if possible whether articles of impeachment should be found, and on the other it is asked by the passage of the minority resolution to relieve the Secretary from any want of confidence in the management of the Naval Department.

It is not my purpose to discuss either the merits or demerits of these reports; but I have a right to ask, in the name of my State, of which the Secretary of the Navy is a citizen, that, in the absence of specific and distinct charges, the report of the majority of the committee may be recommitted for more positive and conclusive action, or that the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report without delay, that the Secretary may be enabled to make his defense at the bar of the Senate before the close of the present session of Congress. It is a matter in which the honor of New Jersey is concerned; and, arguing from that sense of justice due to the humblest of her citizens, it would be the grossest injustice to permit this resolution of the majority to remain without final action at this session.

Sir, if the Secretary of the Navy has been faithless to his high trust I shall not be his defender, but I ask that prompt and immediate action be taken, which shall insure a final and complete settlement of the case at this session.

For my State I ask this act of justice for him. But I ask it without his knowledge, and

although his political opponent I have ever been. * * * Sir, in this case I would be generous to an assailed political foe. If injustice has been meted out to him by practically denying to him that trial before his peers to which every citizen is entitled, then I would shield him until such opportunity is afforded. Such are the common instincts of all honorable Jerseymen, and such, I hope, are the better instincts of our poor humanity. I would believe him honest until the contrary is proved, for New Jersey would despise the unfaithful officer. * * * If you decide to strike, she bids you first to hear. She will believe him innocent until the Senate of his country shall adjudge him guilty. But venture not, in the name of that Democracy for the maintenance of whose principles we have so long struggled here and for whom we are now appealing to the nation—dare not, I beseech you, render here your indictment against a son of New Jersey unless you are willing to yield him a speedy and effective trial. New Jersey asks but justice and will abide the verdict.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. In accordance with the agreement made by the House, I now call the previous question.

Mr. GARFIELD. I ask the gentleman to allow me to enter a motion to recommit the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. No, sir; I must insist on my motion.

Mr. GARFIELD. I ask the gentleman to allow me to test the sense of the House on that question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The sense of the House can be just as well tested upon the motion for the previous question.

Mr. GARFIELD. I hope the gentleman will let me enter the motion.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. I cannot yield to the gentleman.

The question was put on seconding the demand for the previous question; and on a division there were—ayes 81, noes 70.

So the previous question was seconded.

The main question was then ordered to be put.

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

REMARKS OF STEPHEN A. HURLBUT, M. C.,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 29, 1876.

Mr. HURLBUT: "Fortunately we have official documents that show in rare contrasts the fidelity and honesty of official men since 1834. On the 19th day of June, 1876, the Secretary of the Treasury reported to the Senate of the United States a full and detailed statement of receipts and disbursements from January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1875; and also the amount of defalcations in gross and the ratio of losses per \$1,000 to the aggregate received and disbursed, in answer to a resolution of the Senate of February 9, 1876."

These reports are printed in full on pages 14 and 15.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C., June 19, 1876.

STATEMENT showing the Receipts and Disbursements of the Government from January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1875; exhibiting also the amount of defalcations and the ratio of losses per \$1,000 to the aggregate received and disbursed, arranged in periods, as nearly as practicable, of four years each, and also in the periods prior and subsequent to June 30, 1861; prepared under the direction of the Secretary, to accompany his answer to a resolution of the United States Senate, dated February 9, 1876, calling for a detailed statement of balances due from public officers no longer in the public service, which have arisen since 1830:

RECEIPTS, LOSSES AND RATIO OF LOSS PER \$1,000 TO AGGREGATE OF RECEIPTS.

PERIOD.	CUSTOMS.			INTERNAL REVENUE.			MISCELLANEOUS.		
	Receipts.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Receipts.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Receipts.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.
	January 1, 1834, to December 31, 1837	\$70,185,498 66	\$1,211,566 25	\$17 26	\$25,519 41	\$62,796,953 70
January 1, 1838, to December 31, 1841	67,283,414 08	264,502 94	3 93	9,954 20	26,832,178 67
January 1, 1842, to June 30, 1845	78,949,436 31	254,939 03	3 23	5,892 71	8,545,683 07
July 1, 1845, to June 30, 1849	110,564,342 31	7,719 11	06	3,647 26	12,019,158 04
July 1, 1849, to June 30, 1853	194,957,446 48	215,749 08	1 10	12,624,329 01
July 1, 1853, to June 30, 1857	245,148,753 03	131,277 05	53	37,024,174 86
July 1, 1857, to June 30, 1861	184,125,082 85	38,776 03	21	12,838,290 35
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1865	305,360,453 61	31,261 99	10	356,846,137 30	\$423,288 60	\$1 18	67,251,745 08
July 1, 1865, to June 30, 1869	699,977,488 65	264,498 55	36	924,698,401 12	2,123,602 16	2 29	91,743,064 44
July 1, 1869, to June 30, 1873	805,268,591 96	20,935 15	02	572,369,401 98	826,265 67	1 14	79,624,848 56
July 1, 1873, to June 30, 1875	320,271,556 04	3,407 28	01	212,417,278 48	283,195 63	1 38	51,273,027 73
Total	3,082,089,093 98	2,434,632 46	78	2,066,371,242 46	3,659,352 06	1 77	462,573,453 51
January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861	\$951,211,003 72	\$2,124,529 49	\$2 23	\$40,023 58	\$172,680,767 70
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1875	2,130,878,090 26	310,102 97	14	2,066,331,218 88	\$3,659,352 06	\$1 77	239,892,685 81

RECEIPTS, LOSSES, AND RATIO OF LOSS PER \$1,000 TO AGGREGATE OF RECEIPTS—Continued.

PERIOD.	MISCELLANEOUS—Continued.			NET TOTAL.			GROSS TOTAL.		
	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Receipts.	Losses.	Receipts.	Loss on \$1,000.	Losses.	Receipts.*	Loss on \$1,000.
	January 1, 1834, to December 31, 1837	\$172,259 16	\$2 74	133,002,971 77	1,383,825 41	\$10 40	\$1,383,825 41	\$1,383,825 41	\$10 17
January 1, 1838, to December 31, 1841	127,825 40	4 76	94,125,586 95	392,328 34	4 16	129,948,548 91	392,328 34	3 01	
January 1, 1842, to June 30, 1845	175,042 36	20 48	87,493,012 09	429,981 39	4 91	116,736,004 87	429,981 39	3 68	
July 1, 1845, to June 30, 1849	10,390 87	86	122,587,147 61	18,109 98	14	201,857,508 45	18,109 98	08	
July 1, 1849, to June 30, 1853	60,521 50	4 79	207,581,775 49	276,270 58	1 33	211,908,612 91	276,270 58	1 20	
July 1, 1853, to June 30, 1857	81,724 73	2 80	282,172,927 89	213,001 78	75	282,179,829 53	213,001 78	75	
July 1, 1857, to June 30, 1861	155,227 80	12 03	196,963,373 20	194,003 83	98	312,359,679 56	194,003 83	62	
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1865	53,943 01	80	729,458,335 99	508,493 60	69	4,670,460,137 61	508,493 60	10	
July 1, 1865, to June 30, 1869	181,621 19	1 97	1,716,418,954 21	2,562,721 90	1 49	4,042,316,438 46	2,562,721 90	63	
July 1, 1869, to June 30, 1873	107,497 86	1 35	1,457,267,842 50	954,698 68	65	2,576,645,585 72	954,698 68	37	
July 1, 1873, to June 30, 1875	35,581 01	69	583,961,862 25	322,183 92	55	1,420,222,898 62	322,183 92	22	
Total	1,161,634 89	2 51	5,611,033,789 95	7,255,619 41	1 29	14,100,631,005 09	7,255,619 41	51	
January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861	\$782,991 82	\$4 53	\$1,123,931,795 00	\$2,907,521 31	\$2 58	\$1,397,986,145 18	\$2,907,521 31	\$2 09	
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1875	378,643 07	1 30	4,487,101,994 95	4,348,098 10	96	12,709,645,039 91	4,348,098 10	34	

*Includes receipts for loans.

DISBURSEMENTS, LOSSES, AND RATIO OF LOSS PER \$1,000 TO AGGREGATE DISBURSEMENTS.

PERIOD.	WAR.			NAVY.			INDIANS.			PENSI ONS.		
	Disburse-ments.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Disburse-ments.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Disburse-ments.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Disburse-ments.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.
Jan. 1, 1834, to Dec. 31, 1837.	\$36,885,422 32	\$502,062 83	\$13 60	\$20,275,832 24	\$213,405 94	\$10 53	\$12,095,456 75	\$130,256 56	\$10 76	\$10,873,957 03	\$17,906 63	\$1 65
Jan. 1, 1838, to Dec. 31, 1841.	37,711,097 43	206,873 89	5 48	24,423,848 64	101,216 23	4 14	12,879,740 60	4,215 61	32	10,290,804 48	101,951 64	9 90
Jan. 1, 1842, to June 30, 1845.	20,483,584 91	48,359 58	2 35	24,920,331 48	54,291 93	2 17	4,573,354 42	10,585 29	2 31	6,650,769 55	11,553 38	1 74
July 1, 1845, to June 30, 1849.	88,500,203 38	747,275 33	8 44	33,550,831 62	115,666 69	3 45	5,084,533 30	11,763 92	2 31	6,112,345 44	71,196 44	11 64
July 1, 1849, to June 30, 1853.	40,280,994 37	373,158 05	9 26	36,771,937 67	141,493 87	3 85	11,417,463 40	69,497 61	6 08	8,318,423 22	1,257 41	15
July 1, 1853, to June 30, 1857.	62,492,668 32	378,333 37	6 05	51,843,720 68	377,505 68	7 42	11,322,013 17	38,088 97	3 36	5,316,887 56	18,840 51	3 54
July 1, 1857, to June 30, 1861.	88,307,575 55	237,516 48	3 25	52,645,998 89	183,510 52	3 49	14,323,403 42	982,417 05	68 58	4,577,393 06	4,649 51	1 01
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1865.	2,713,569,422 83	4,241,868 55	1 56	314,223,983 21	1,079,639 44	3 43	13,199,317 75	136,582 62	10 37	23,263,779 07	29,650 45	1 27
July 1, 1865, to June 30, 1869.	583,749,510 99	542,547 69	9 2	120,173,925 90	93,422 02	8 1	19,135,153 08	73,973 97	3 86	88,810,848 02	94,540 67	1 06
July 1, 1869, to June 30, 1873.	175,150,962 73	169,900 39	9 7	85,957,323 85	180,964 63	2 10	25,848,369 29	23,557 44	9 1	120,676,926 67	230,823 93	1 90
July 1, 1873, to June 30, 1875.	83,434,573 20	23,742 80	28	52,430,213 69	26,670 77	50	15,077,118 91	2,676 38	17	53,494,630 88
Total	3,930,566,021 03	7,521,633 96	1 91	3,162,252,930 88	2,572,827 77	3 15	144,927,954 09	1,483,620 42	10 23	343,386,769 85	582,373 57	1 69
Jan. 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861.	374,661,551 28	2,543,579 53	6 79	243,437,501 22	1,187,130 86	4 87	71,697,995 06	1,246,830 01	17 39	52,140,585 21	227,355 52	4 36
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1875.	3,555,904,469 75	4,978,059 43	1 39	572,815,449 66	1,335,693 91	2 41	73,229,959 03	233,790 41	3 23	291,246,184 64	355,018 05	1 21

DISBURSEMENTS, LOSSES, AND RATIO OF LOSS PER \$1,000 TO AGGREGATE DISBURSEMENTS—CONTINUED.

PERIOD.	MISCELLANEOUS.			POST OFFICE.			NET TOTAL, EXCLUSIVE OF POST OFFICE.			GROSS TOTAL, EXCLUSIVE OF POST OFFICE.		
	Disburse-ments.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Disburse-ments.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Disburse-ments.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Disburse-ments.*	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.
Jan. 1, 1834, to Dec. 31, 1837.	\$23,921,077 47	\$300,154 05	\$12 54	\$11,697,884 18	\$13,636 56	\$1 17	\$104,051,745 81	\$1,163,786 01	\$11 18	\$110,308,325 19	\$1,163,786 01	\$10 55
Jan. 1, 1838, to Dec. 31, 1841.	25,372,936 06	2,485,356 47	9 75	18,234,961 77	51,809 86	2 83	110,683,427 21	2,899,653 84	26 19	137,094,438 34	2,899,653 84	21 15
Jan. 1, 1842, to June 30, 1845.	21,535,382 45	1,008,452 22	46 82	18,666,750 20	2,679 46	14	78,163,322 81	1,133,242 40	14 49	169,187,401 24	1,133,242 40	10 37
July 1, 1845, to June 30, 1849.	32,133,077 73	765,262 44	23 84	16,861,478 41	2,571 24	15	163,381,026 34	1,712,169 82	10 35	205,194,700 57	1,712,169 82	8 34
July 1, 1849, to June 30, 1853.	68,899,995 00	899,785 74	13 05	23,582,570 74	52,946 20	1 99	165,688,818 66	1,485,192 68	8 96	194,370,493 14	1,485,192 68	7 64
July 1, 1853, to June 30, 1857.	111,122,107 75	892,084 11	7 75	40,439,110 70	280,128 05	6 92	241,097,397 48	1,674,852 64	6 94	285,638,875 65	1,674,852 64	5 86
July 1, 1857, to June 30, 1861.	101,502,323 81	834,731 96	8 22	56,957,922 74	172,278 46	3 02	261,359,197 73	2,492,825 52	8 77	323,183,268 39	2,297,825 52	6 98
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1865.	115,145,844 93	1,111,281 85	9 65	48,779,085 45	93,467 63	1 91	3,179,372,350 79	6,599,022 91	2 07	4,667,457,921 22	6,599,022 91	1 41
July 1, 1865, to June 30, 1869.	201,923,036 61	1,080,155 82	5 34	81,016,286 91	167,236 74	2 06	1,013,795,474 60	1,889,641 17	1 86	3,891,576,259 10	1,889,641 17	4 48
July 1, 1869, to June 30, 1873.	248,032,245 27	440,953 01	1 77	104,132,079 69	117,797 60	1 13	655,695,827 82	1,046,202 48	1 59	2,601,158,569 90	1,046,202 48	40
July 1, 1873, to June 30, 1875.	153,212,296 59	317,248 86	2 03	65,737,724 03	34,970 63	5 3	365,648,833 27	370,333 81	1 01	1,403,693,819 31	370,333 81	26
Total	1,105,833,726 67	10,106,467 56	9 13	439,155,854 82	989,582 38	2 02	6,340,937,422 52	22,266,928 28	3 51	13,936,870,072 05	22,266,928 28	\$10 59
Jan. 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861.	384,487,333 27	7,156,826 99	18 61	189,490,673 74	576,109 78	3 04	1,123,424,935 04	12,331,722 91	10 97	1,369,977,502 52	12,361,722 91	9 02
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1875.	721,316,423 40	2,949,640 57	4 08	299,665,176 08	413,472 60	1 38	5,214,512,486 48	9,905,205 37	1 89	12,566,892,569 53	9,905,205 37	7 8

*Includes expenditures for public debt. POSTAL MONEY ORDERS.—Amount involved to June 30, 1875, \$389,718,735.38. Loss, \$156,818.42. Loss per \$1,000, 40 cents. Notes.—1. In cases where the accounts of defaulting officers embraced more than one period, the losses, unless known to have occurred in other periods, have been charged to the periods in which they are reported on the books, though doubtless in several instances they actually occurred in previous periods. No losses of the latter kind, however, have been included unless known to have occurred within the period covered by this statement. 2. No deductions have been made for amounts which may be collected hereafter, though a large percentage of the recent losses will doubtless be yet recovered. 3. In preparing this statement, the receipts and disbursements since June 30, 1843, have been classified by fiscal years, as in the published official reports; the losses have in all cases been classified by calendar years, it not being practicable to separate the losses occurring in the fractional years of each period; but the periods compared being of the same length the result is substantially correct.

Mr. HURLBUT, in an analysis of the foregoing figures, submitted the following :

FROM JACKSON'S SECOND TERM TO THE END OF BUCHANAN'S TERM.

Gross total receipts and disbursements from January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861—\$2,950,454,326.44 includes loans and Post Office; \$2,250,356,731.04 excludes loans and Post Office.

Gross total losses for the same period, (no loss on loans,) \$15,845,354.

Gross total loss on \$1,000, including loans and Post Office, \$5.35.

Gross total loss on \$1,000, excluding loans and Post Office, 7.04.

UNDER LINCOLN, JOHNSON AND GRANT.

Gross total receipts and disbursements from July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1875—\$25,576,202,805.52 includes loans and Post Office; \$9,701,614,481.43 excludes loans and Post Office.

Gross total losses for the same period, (no loss on loans,) \$14,666,776.07.

Gross total loss on \$1,000, including loans and Post Office, 57 cents.

Gross total loss on \$1,000, excluding loans and Post Office, \$1.51.

It appears, then, from the official records of the Treasury Department, prepared in obedience to an order of the Senate, that—

The gross total of receipts and disbursements from the beginning of Jackson's second term to the end of Buchanan's, including loans and Post Office, was \$2,950,454,326 44

The gross total of receipts and disbursements for the same period, excluding loans and Post Office, was 2,250,356,731 04

Gross losses 15,845,354 00

Ratio of losses per \$1,000 on total receipts and disbursements, including loans and Post Office 5 36

Ratio on same, excluding loans and Post Office. 7 04

Under Lincoln, Johnson and Grant both receipts and disbursements were infinitely larger, and yet the gross amount of losses was smaller and the percentage almost ridiculously disproportioned. Thus—

The gross total of receipts and disbursements, including loans and Post Office, was \$25,576,202,985 32

On the same, including loans and Post Office. 9,701,614,481 43

Gross losses 14,666,776 07

Ratio of losses per \$1,000 on total receipts and disbursements, including loans and Post Office 57

Ratio on same, including loans and Post Office 1 51

Thus under Democracy in its purity before the war, and under Republican administration including the war, the receipts and disbursements of the first, including loans and Post Office, were about one-ninth of the second; the receipts and disbursements of the first, including loans and Post Office, were about one-fourth of those of the second, while the losses and defalcations of the Democratic period were nearly ten times as great when the loans and Post Office are included, and four and a half times as great when those items are excluded.

But the table bears closer investigation, and you will find, Mr. Speaker, that the nearer you come to this actual time in which we live, to this present, existing, much-abused administration of President Grant, the standard of honor and fidelity as measured by the official reports becomes higher and firmer.

The very lowest rate of losses ever reached is in this present presidential term :

On receipts23
On disbursements26
In the Post Office53

and this tabular statement stands in grand contrast with the record of any President of any party who has ever preceded President Grant.

So much for the charge of gross official dishonesty reaching through and corrupting the entire Republican party. The official tables give the lie direct to this wholesale campaign accusation.

Yet in face of these known facts the Democratic party in the House organized themselves into a scandal-making machine, took upon themselves the office of professional slanderers, and charged every one of the regular committees of the House, and many special ones, with this unsavory business.

Public business has been willfully neglected; public necessities ignored, and the whole weight and power of Congress devoted to the manufacture of political capital for the pending election.

Every broken official kicked out for thievery, every cashiered officer, every nameless vagabond was invited, solicited, urged to testify. Partly for revenge, partly for witness fees, partly for cheap notoriety, these birds of evil omen flocked to the Capitol, thronged the corridors, took possession of the committee-rooms and of the committees, prompted questions, invented answers, retailed old scandals, picked up second-hand, the dead refuse of the streets, to be greedily swallowed by the mouths that stood agape for such carrion food.

The common rights of individual citizens were grossly violated, the sanctity of private correspondence outraged, the telegraphic messages unlawfully forced from their proper keepers, citizens imprisoned by order of the House for no valid reason, and all the rights of private individuals secured by the Constitution trampled down by the decree of the House of Representatives. Secret sessions were held, parties charged with wrong-doing kept in ignorance, and the poor privilege granted to all criminals of an open investigation and of meeting witnesses face to face was denied.

In all this one single and most melancholy case of official misdoing has been undeniably made known, and that has been fairly presented to the proper tribunal by the active co-operation of the Republicans in the House.

You are now trying, Mr. Speaker, by a most singular report from the Committee on Naval Affairs to smirch the reputation of another officer to whom neither the committee nor the House dare give the benefits of cross-examination of witnesses and of an open impeachment and a fair trial before the Senate and the nation.